

**Summary Minutes  
City of Sedona  
Historic Preservation Commission Meeting  
Vultee Conference Room, 102 Roadrunner Drive, Building 106, Sedona, Arizona  
Monday, August 11, 2014 – 4:00 p.m.**

**(10 minutes, 4:00 - 4:10 pm for items 1 - 3)**

**1. Verification of notice, call to order, roll call**

Chair Unger verified notice and called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

**Roll Call:**

**Commissioners Present:** Chair Brynn Burkee Unger and Commissioners Jane Grams, Allyson Holmes, Charlie Schudson, and Steve Segner. Vice Chair Ann Jarmusch was excused.

**Staff Present:** Audree Juhlin

**Council Liaison Present:** Dan McIlroy

**2. Commission and Staff announcements**

Audree Juhlin indicated that the vacancy created by Catherine Coté's departure was re-advertised and applications will be accepted through the end of August, and Chair Unger announced that she received a document of all of the great churches in the world and Chapel of the Holy Cross was #6.

**3. Approval of the June 23, 2014 (Site Visit) and June 23, 2014 (Special Meeting) minutes**

***MOTION: Commissioner Segner moved to approve the minutes as written. Commissioner Holmes seconded the motion. No objection was voiced; however, no vote was requested.***

**4. Update/discussion on the self-guided "Walking History" project (10 minutes, 4:10-4:20)**

Commissioner Segner reported that he and Commissioner Schudson have been working on it the past week and 10 plaques are going out this week for a manufacturer, and they are going to manufacture the stands. It should all be back in about six weeks, so he is hoping to have 10-12 plaques up the last week of September. He is getting more donations than he has plaques ready at this point. By the end of the year, he hopes to have 18-20 plaques up and there are almost 30 outlined, but getting volunteers for the writing slows us down.

*Note: Chair Unger noted that there was no public forum on the agenda and proceeded to ask if there was anyone who wished to speak to an item that is not on the agenda, and there were no requests to speak.*

**5. Update/discussion on the historic resource survey (10 minutes, 4:20-4:30)**

Audree Juhlin indicated that Cynthia Lovely was going to provide an update; however, she is not present yet, so this item can be deferred until she arrives.

**6. Discussion regarding 2014 Historic Preservation Annual Conference (10 minutes, 4:30-4:40)**

Chair Unger noted that Catherine Coté is not here, but she also attended the conference. The Chair indicated that her goal was to find out if there were ways that we could bring money into the City for historic preservation and even other projects, so most of her time was spent on grant writing and projects that had brought in money in different ways. She brought back that information and met with Tim Ernster and Karen Daines to discuss where we might find monies. A course on grant writing was rather eye-opening in that the instructor felt that Sedona shouldn't need a grant,

because we have enough money; however, she advised the instructor that we don't have a property tax and there is a need for monies from other sources. Another big session was by Hugh Hallman, former Mayor of the City of Tempe and the former Director of the Rio Salado Foundation, and the discussion was about how they raised \$25 million for the Rio Salado Park, and she hopes to receive more information from him, because they moved Sandra Day O'Connor's original home onto the Tempe Town Lake property, and they are also renovating an older building there that was built by a Jewish person who had been denied access to Phoenix resorts. He mentioned that he would be more than happy to come and talk to us about raising monies for different projects. Chair Unger added that it was one of the more productive conferences, in terms of going for something, looking for it and bringing back the information.

Commissioner Holmes asked if the person's attitude about Sedona will prevent us from getting grants or if it was just an individual's prejudice. The Chair indicated that it was just an individual's prejudice and it was also shown to the person who was there from Scottsdale, but it does say that we have to allow people to understand what our grant requests are for and why we need them. Now, Historic Preservation for the State of Arizona has so much to do with the Native American history, the Native Americans will have an easier course to take to get monies.

#### **5. Update/discussion on the historic resource survey (10 minutes, 4:20-4:30) (continued)**

Cynthia Lovely indicated that she wanted to provide an update regarding the Historic Resource Survey. The original survey was done in 1992 and updated in 2001 and 2008. Now, we are doing a couple of things differently. We are following the CLG guidelines that talk about having a system for the survey and inventory of historic properties for the changes made. One of the biggest changes was redoing the inventory form, because the 2008 survey goes back to the 1992 forms and SHPO has changed their forms, which are aligned with the National Register criteria, so we needed our forms to align with SHPO's and the National Register's and that is on the CLG requirements indicating that survey and inventory efforts must be compatible with the State's program. Therefore, there is a new form for inventorying and also a new update form, which we didn't have in the past. The update form is an abbreviated version of the longer survey form.

Cynthia added that another thing that will be different is that the document itself was reorganized and will be in three sections. The first section will be all of our historic landmarks, and in the survey book, there was the Summary of Designated Landmarks with a photo and a brief description of our landmarks, but if you wanted more detailed information, you had to flip to the original survey form in the back. Now, those two are combined and the first section is all of the information on the 23 landmarks with additional photos. The second part is what we are calling Additions to the Survey and those are new surveys that were just completed in May. The third section will be the previously surveyed properties, which we didn't have the budget or time to redo and on some just added that there was a re-survey in May of 2014, plus there might be a few corrections.

Cynthia indicated that appendices will be similar to the old one. We have our City criteria and the National Register criteria, but we will have another section called Other Historic Sites. If you look in the 2008 book under Summary of Results they list properties that were ineligible, because of alterations, demolitions, etc., and we didn't want to lose that information, so it will be a separate section in an easier to read list.

Cynthia explained that the idea in re-doing it is to make it more user-friendly for the Commission and staff. We often get people at the front counter who only know an address and want to know if it is historic or a landmark, so it will be organized more by address with an index in the back of everything, so from there you can go directly to the address. In the old book, you really needed to know the survey site number and it was difficult to find information.

Cynthia then indicated that regarding the field work portion, in May of 2014, Nancy Burgess inspected all of the properties to determine historic integrity, which means determining if there have been any significant changes. She only looked at the exterior and took photos in some cases. She

looked at the 23 landmarks and about 34 previously surveyed sites. She wasn't able to get to one and there were only two that had changes. One was the Gassaway House, which she documented on our update form and the other one was the Chapel, because they put in some planters out front, which she documented on the new update form and photographed, but she didn't think it was a significant change, because it was compatible, etc.

Cynthia added that Nancy was also asked to survey some new sites and there were eight different locations. We looked through all of the files and Kathy had identified a lot of those sites in the past, and then Chair Unger reviewed it and recommended a few, and the list was reduced to the eight sites that Nancy fully surveyed, including determining eligibility, which wasn't something on the former survey forms; therefore, she also had to do some research on those and all of that information is being compiled into the new survey. Everything will be in a .pdf format, so it can be put on the website in three sections, and you won't have to open the whole document.

Cynthia indicated that the part we have not gotten to that needs to be finished is the GIS data. Currently, you can go on the City's website and pull up the GIS maps, and then click the layer for historic parcels, and all that information came from the survey, so the next step is to correct the GIS information. We should have a copy for everyone to look at by the September meeting.

Audree Juhlin added that it will be agendized for discussion/possible action on the September agenda. Chair Unger noted that there were originally more than 200 sites in the document, so does the CLG process have anything to do with looking at the other sites or are we just focusing on the 36. Audree Juhlin explained that SHPO indicated that it is not expected that a full analysis be done every year. It is up to the Commission and City to determine how we want to manage the survey. It can be done all in one swoop, a little can be done each year, or it can be done every few years.

Chair Unger asked how staff came up with the 36 and Audree explained that a lot of it was determined by the budget, and Cynthia explained that the numbers are a little misleading. In 2008, they said that the original numbers were established in the 1992 survey, but they didn't put them all in the book. The records may have been lost, because it says that they didn't know the survey numbers of some of them, so in 2008, they started with 251 and continued from there, so there actually aren't 200 of them.

Chair Unger indicated that when she was going through the photographs, there were a number of them that she could slot in, but some of them shouldn't be looked at any longer. Audree explained that we don't want to lose that information, because the Commission changes and we want to retain that information to avoid duplication. The Chair asked if there might be others that need to be set aside to look at next year, but indicated that can be discussed when you provide what you have.

Commissioner Schudson asked about the acronyms used and Cynthia explained that CLG is Certified Local Government, and Audree explained that the City applied for that status in the mid-1990's and we entered into an agreement with SHPO (State Historic Preservation Office) that establishes how the Commission and staff will handle historic preservation. It allows the City to utilize outside expertise and apply for funding, such as the scholarship funding received for the conference. The agreement tells us how we are going to do business and each year we are required to do an Annual Report, and it tells us how we are to fill Commission vacancies, how we do the Resource Survey, etc. Cynthia then explained that GIS is the Geographic Information Systems and it is the combination of a map and database. Audree explained that the map is the visual piece and behind that are a number of layers of data. If you click on a parcel, it identifies the property owner, zoning, if it is an historic property, if there are any flooding issues, etc.

Councilor McIlroy asked for clarification regarding the 200+ and if eight more have been discovered to be implemented in the next plan. Cynthia clarified that the 200 number is misleading, because many of the 280 or so site numbers aren't included. What is actually included in the final is more like 60 with 23 landmarks, 34 previously surveyed sites and 8 new ones, in addition to the other ineligible sites. Audree explained that the eligibility determination was either determined by Nancy

Burgess, the Commission or previous survey information. If there is something in the survey that we think needs to be moved to that designation, staff will make a recommendation to the Commission to make that determination.

Chair Unger encouraged the Commissioners to look at that to be familiar with it. The Chair then thanked staff and Nancy Burgess for their work. Cynthia noted that she will add a section for acronyms.

**6. Discussion/possible action regarding a request for approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior rehabilitation/renovation on the historic structure known as the "George Jordan Sales Building", located at 470 N. State Route 89A, Sedona, Arizona 86336. The subject property is approximately 0.173 of an acre, zoned C-1 (General Commercial) and further identified as Assessor's Parcel 401-13-019. (45 minutes, 4:40-5:25)**

<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>Kevin Dunlap, agent for owner</b>
<b>Property Address:</b>	<b>470 N. State Route 89A, Sedona, Arizona 86336</b>
<b>Parcel No.:</b>	<b>401-13-019</b>
<b>Property Owner:</b>	<b>Gregg &amp; Ali Ponder</b>
<b>Case Number:</b>	<b>CA 14-03</b>

Chair Unger introduced the item and noted that Kevin Dunlap, agent for the owner, and owner Gregg Ponder were present. The Chair then explained the process that would be followed by the Commission.

Audree Juhlin introduced Nick Gioello, Development Services Manager in Community Development, and indicated that he will be the Commission's staff liaison, so you will see him more frequently as we transition. Audree then explained that this request is for a Certificate of Appropriateness for some rehabilitation/renovation work on Landmark #5. It was landmarked in 1998 and nothing has been done to the building since that time and very little maintenance has taken place, so it is in need of some TLC. The Staff Report goes over the items that the applicant is proposing and staff has looked at it from a number of considerations; therefore, Kevin Dunlap will present what is being proposed, but keep in mind that we also looked at the Sedona Main Street Design and Character District Guidelines, because that is what staff, outside of the Commission, will be looking at in addition to the Land Development Code and Building Codes. The Design Guidelines for Main Street are really important, in addition to historic preservation, and most of what is included in the guidelines are concepts of historic preservation of the character, but it is something they also need to meet in addition to the Commission's requirements for preservation and renovation.

**Presentation by Kevin Dunlap, representing the Applicant:** Indicated that he has operated a company in town for 20 years and he has an extensive background in urban planning, plus some experience with historic preservation, so he appreciates the efforts of the Commission. Mr. Ponder is a client and they have worked on other residential projects together. Mr. Ponder and his wife purchased the property about three or four months ago and they started some evaluation before their purchase and met with Audree Juhlin, so they have a pretty good understanding of the City's and Commission's objectives. They both recognize the importance of this building and it is one of the more important buildings, because of its history and it being a very visible property in Uptown.

Kevin explained that they have a design team and Eric Seitz is the architectural individual out of Cottonwood, and he has been a designer in the Verde Valley for years. The registered Structural Engineer is Brent Maupin who is also an architect and has worked in Sedona for years. Kevin wanted to note that the elevations on the east and west side of the building were mislabeled, so please disregard that. A correction has been made on an updated set of plans. Also regarding an item in the Staff Report where staff indicated that regarding the exterior windows, the cost consideration was primary in the evaluation of what windows to use; however, that wasn't the real driving factor, but there will be more discussion about that.

Kevin indicated that the purpose of the proposal is to rehabilitate the building, because it has been sadly neglected for a number of years, and just from a fundamental stability factor, there are a number of things that need to be done structurally in addition to the electrical and mechanical systems, which are beyond repair. One of the objectives is to put the building back into a serviceable condition and do some modernization where applicable, but also preserve the historic values within the building.

Kevin indicated that they did discuss what some of the design objectives in the Uptown Character District Guidelines are, and the design team tried to incorporate those aspects into the rehabilitation plan. They are trying to achieve a balance between modernizing the building to create a viable commercial building in Uptown and to maintain the historic values. The envelope of the building is not being changed; they are not expanding the building. They intend to demolish a small add-on on the north side of the building, but it doesn't appear to have any historical significance. They looked at trying to salvage that piece with some window dressing, but the structural integrity wasn't good, so Mr. Ponder has decided to demolish that and do a ground-up construction to get the additional square footage included in the building.

Kevin explained that they have done some clean-up and demolition on the interior of the building under a City permit, but they haven't done anything significant on the exterior of the building, other than removing the previous retailer's sign, but they are trying to balance the values between economic and commercial viability and historic preservation. The intent is to keep the integrity of the building with the red rock structure intact, and everybody on the job will be cognizant of avoiding penetrations into the red rock structure. They will probably run some electrical conduits on the outside of the building and will need to paint them to match, although the electrical design hasn't been completed. The intent is to avoid drilling or creating disruption to the structure and even the demolition aspects will have to be done with a lot of care, with the intent to not disrupt the structure.

Kevin indicated that the storefront will be a focal point and they intend to take the shed roof completely off. He doesn't know how that dates to the original building, but it may or may not have been part of the original building. It is certainly not sound, so they will construct a new shed roof structure that is attached to the red rock building. The proposed roofing materials are Corten corrugated metal. The Staff Report and his Letter of Intent talked about pre-rusted, and Corten typically comes with a rust-inhibited layer, so you apply the material and use some agent to commence the rusting process, and then it will rust to whatever color within a matter of months and that rust-inhibiting layer takes over and it won't continue to rust, while other corrugated metals will rust continuously, so Corten is an upgrade.

Audree Juhlin pointed out that the roof in the black and white picture is a flat-bed roof whereas a 4 -12 pitch roof is proposed. Kevin explained that the previous roof is flat and that is one of the reasons it is deteriorated, but they felt they could build an architectural feature that would be compatible with what they are proposing. Audree added that the reason for the pitch is for drainage.

Kevin indicated that he received the engineering drawings today and much of those details relate to how to attach something structurally. There are no architectural changes to discuss on the basic design of the modifications and they plan to file for a Building Permit in the next several days. Once they receive the Commission's approval, they will complete the demolition work, which consists of removal of the existing front porch, the north add-on, the roof on the shed building in the rear and removing all of the exterior doors and windows that need to be replaced, and that will be done under an amended permit for the demolition work, and they propose to do that while they are waiting on the Building Permit from the City.

Kevin provided some sample materials and explained that one was a piece of Corten metal, but the color should be disregarded, because it was treated one time with vinegar. If it was treated a few more times, it would continue to darken and at some point, it would achieve a rusted

metal color. It would probably take from 120 to 180 days for the roof to get fully rusted and it would be non-reflective upon installation, but it will rust down until the Corten layer kicks-in, and then it will stop. The exterior woods will be exposed rough-sawn wood beams and they are proposing that the underside of the porch also be rough-sawn exposed, so when you look up, you will basically see the bottom of the metal and the rough-sawn supporting structure. All of the other woods, including the board and batten, will be rough-sawn and the color will be a natural color. For the exterior lighting scheme, they proposed some fixtures in galvanized metal and they are on the drawings. They are compatible with the overall architectural look of the building and the intent of lighting it to highlight the rock and to provide lighting for the signage.

Kevin pointed out that they provided a mock-up window that reflects the materials. The front of the building would create a commercial storefront look and the intent is to use the upstairs as a retail operation so visibility into the building as well as the functionality of the doors is important. None of the rock openings will be changed with the exception of a door at the north end of the front of the building that they propose to not have in service, and the plans reflect a red rock planter, and then converting that into a matching window, so there wouldn't be two doors in and out of the front.

Kevin indicated that there are two doors on the lower or east side of the building; one is a commercial-grade anodized framed door and that will be used for primary access, and then on the storage building, they will have a custom wood rough-sawn door made with 2-inch jambs and it will be stained to match the other wood on the building. There are some existing scuppers, so they will need to have gutter metal made and collect, off of the scuppers, the roof drainage. The building drains from the west to the east to the back of the building, so they have to control that water. They will probably do a round valley-type gutter and ground downspouts with some kind of rusted or pre-finished anodized metal in dark brown. Kevin added that they intend to use divided-like windows on the other portions of the building that are not on the storefront.

Mr. Ponder, owner, added that he is proud of Kevin and would recommend him as a contractor. Audree indicated that when she first met the Ponders, one of the things that impressed her was their desire to preserve this building. They liked the historic building and wanted to renovate this building.

#### **Commission's Comments, Questions and Concerns:**

Chair Unger indicated that she understands their desire to make the building more visually accessible and the decision was to leave the openings; however, she is a little concerned about the opening where the door was. Generally when talking about historic preservation, what we are really struggling to do is to have the building look as it did when it was built. One of the biggest things has to do with the windows, and this is something that has become very sensitive for all of the Commissioners, because when they are changed to plate glass windows, that would not have been in keeping with the way the building was when it was built. You want your product to be visible to people driving by, but that is not a concern of the Commission. The Commission's concern is that it actually maintains the look of the building when it was built and its integrity.

Commissioner Segner indicated that he is working with some people on some historic buildings in Jerome, and they make them reproduce every piece of molding, using the original wood and the word anodized doesn't work for him. He understands that you are trying to get a commercial building going again, but you have to rebuild it, putting it back the way it was. The doors should be the way they are, but they should work better; the windows should be the way they are, but they should keep the wind and water out, and as far as the flat roof in the front, flat roofs are impractical, but they are what people built in that period of time, and it should stay a flat roof. Put it back the way it was, but make it more sound.

Kevin Dunlap indicated that he appreciates their comments and understands their point-of-view. He was led to believe that because of a number of factors – one, it is a commercial building; second, it is going to be retail space; and third, Mr. Ponder is planning to spend a lot of money and it has to be economically viable for him and his tenants, and there was a balance in what they are trying to do in preserving the historic buildings and the economic viability and practicality. He appreciates what they are doing in Jerome, but are we trying to be like Jerome? Commissioner Segner stated that historically, he thinks so; we shouldn't be less than Jerome. Kevin indicated that he isn't suggesting that we should be, but we are different.

Chair Unger stated that she really doesn't care where Jerome is going, but from the books, "... using replacement material that does not match the historic window or failing to properly document the new work". They want you to create it in the same format that was used before. She can go on and on about, "Altering windows or window features, which are important in defining the historic character of the building, so that as a result, the character is diminished". It does diminish the character of the building to change to plate glass windows. It feels like it was built later than that building was built.

The Chair indicated that there are landmarked homes that have plate glass windows; they were done later than that, and with their wooden framing, we will ask the same thing if those windows are replaced. If you are pleading any kind of financial difficulty, then you would have to make a different argument, but that is not your argument here. As much as we want someone to take care of this building, we aren't going to let it be changed to that point, just so we can keep some of it the way it was. That is not the point of historic preservation. The point of landmarking that building was that we want that building to maintain its historic relevance.

Chair Unger then stated that if you were to request financial assistance from the Federal Government in terms of tax, if you change the windows that is gone. The windows are as important as the red rock.

Kevin Dunlap noted that he is not here to argue; he is here just to present a proposal. First, they want to work with the Commission and come up with something that you will approve. The considerations that were driving this were, A) The storefront, the visibility and the viability, B) Wood windows on the east and south side of the building will require continued and ongoing maintenance, because of their exposure to the elements, and one of the reasons the windows there are totally deteriorated is that they are in wood frames that have been beat-up by the sun, wind and rain and not maintained. If Mr. Ponder is willing to have someone caulk and paint windows every year that is fine, but it isn't practical.

Chair Unger indicated that we will later on begin discussing this amongst the Commission, but she wants them to understand where we are coming from and she wants their feedback. She doesn't want to go into that discussion without having this discussion, so we all understand our concerns. She is concerned about the flat roof versus a slanted roof, and in the blueprints, you had considered doing a much steeper grade originally, and then brought it down to a 4-12. She also understands what you are saying about it not being practical, in terms of it deteriorating, if you flatten it without any pitch in it. Her concern is that when you look at the face of the building, the bigger the pitch, the more you will see that Corten. She tried to see what was originally there, because that is not the original roofing.

Kevin Dunlap explained that they were at a loss to find much information other than one photo, but what we are trying to create is a building that isn't going to be an ongoing maintenance problem for the owner. The Chair asked how it is attached to the building now, if you are going to take that up higher than it is and not drill into the rock. Kevin clarified that he didn't say they aren't going to drill; they are going to do it carefully and only where necessary. The existing roof is attached by a ledger; it is an old wood ledger and it is bolted in. If you look at the building, up on the parapet above that, maybe 4-5 ft. above that roof, are some old l-bolts that are attached and go through the rock and are back-plated on the inside wall of the building.

Historically, he thinks that those I-hooks were steel-rodged down to support an old flat or some type of roof structure, so the roof that you are referring to is not the original roof on that porch, when the Jordan family built the building.

Commissioner Segner commented that he doesn't see a maintenance problem. He has built several buildings in town and most upscale homes in town use wood or wood-clad windows and they are not that hard to paint. Older buildings need more maintenance; that is the way it is, so when you buy one, you can't really come to us and say that you want to make it more user-friendly and easy to take care of; that is really not appropriate. The wood should look like the wood that was there and the windows should look like it. If they have to be painted every year, then they have to be painted every year, and that is just part of owning an old building. Bringing in new things to make it easier to maintain doesn't jive with trying to keep the historic value.

Kevin Dunlap explained that it is not just maintenance, but the quality and integrity of the window. Certainly, we could use wood windows, but so we are clear, if he had been aware of the fact that your goal was for us to bring back a rehabilitation plan that replicated, replaced identical materials, then this plan would look different. He was not aware of that; he was made aware of the fact that we are looking at a sincere and viable effort to preserve the historic building while modernizing aspects of it that are deteriorated or not functioning, and that is what we brought here. If we need to back up, we will back up; we aren't here for an argument.

Chair Unger indicated that we are only trying to explain, because unfortunately we live in an environment where we don't have a lot of these buildings, so we aren't able to explain to the public very often what we are doing, so she understands when somebody doesn't understand that. This is the part of the conversation we need to have. Kevin Dunlap stated that they are here to understand what the Commission wants and for you to understand what we are trying to do.

Audree Juhlin explained that she met with the applicant and their agent, and that is exactly what she told them. She explained that we want this to be a successful commercial business and meet the needs of the existing current commercial situation, while to the best of our ability meeting the intent of renovation and preservation. She never said that they have to take it back and restore it to its original condition, so that direction came from her and she made it clear that it is a balance between modern commercial needs versus renovation and preservation.

Chair Unger stated that if there was a real issue of not being able to replace these windows or there was some other extenuating circumstance, we certainly would be more open, and you are facing the Commission rather than Audree. We are the ones that end up having to discuss this amongst ourselves. It may not be a done deal at the end of this conversation, but she wants all of the points out now and discussed. She feels that knocking down the building on the side isn't any problem, because that was added later and isn't contributing. She likes the way you are approaching it, because that defines it outside of the building itself, and doing board and batten is a brilliant idea, because it does that. You have taken into consideration some things that are important. Removing the chain link fence and some of these other things are advancing what the Commission would want to see happen.

The Chair indicated that she likes the Corten, because we don't know what that roof was and the Sedona Historical Society couldn't tell her. She is worried that if we put a pitch on it, especially up to a 4-12 pitch or more, you will see a lot of that, and she would like for that to disappear more and maybe you can say if you can take that pitch down even more to eliminate that look. Kevin Dunlap indicated that it can come down, but it can't be flat; otherwise, they will have to develop an alternative architectural design, because the Corten is probably functional down to about 2½-12 or maybe 2-12, but flatter than that . . . Commissioner Segner interrupted to ask why it has to be Corten if you do a flat roof. Kevin noted that he wasn't saying it would. Commissioner Segner then stated that if you go to a flat roof, then you just go to a flat roof and



tar. Kevin commented, if that is what you want . . . Commissioner Segner stated that the day it was landmarked is the day he sees what it was. He isn't going to go back 20-30 years before that. When it was commissioned, that is the way he sees the outside staying. He then referenced 1950 homes with steel windows and when people wanted to replace them, we have said no. The windows are integral to the look of the house. Sometimes they need work and aren't practical; it is an old building.

Audree Juhlin indicated that when we were working with the applicant and preparing the materials and type of material designs, mainly from past Commission discussions, the George Jordan Sales Building is similar to the discussion on the Jordan Park roof and a tin metal roof was part of that discussion, and the Commission felt that material was indicative of that time period, which is why staff supported that material for the roof. Also, looking at the inventory, there is not a material specified on the sheet for that area, so she is not going to guess what material was there, and she had said that this is something that has been supported in the past by the Commission and something they feel is indicative of that timeframe, so she gave staff's support from that perspective.

Chair Unger agreed with that perspective, because that was the timeframe they would have had that kind of roof. In fact when we looked at the Jordan Park property, it had corrugated roofs on it, but it didn't last long, so we are talking about the same timeframe. Commissioner Segner stated that we aren't talking about corrugated as much as the pitch of the front. If you pitch it, Corten makes sense, although it has become a little cliché; we have a lot of rust all over, and he isn't fond of Corten, because it rusts evenly and in the old days they used zinc and it rusted in spots. Seeing Corten from the street, it is very uniform, and we are looking at a very un-uniform building that was built a long time ago, so when you put all of these nice new elements together, it makes it too nice. We are looking to bring it back to the way it was, paint it and seal it the way it might have been. Wood for the posts should be old weathered wood, not new wood.

Kevin Dunlap asked about leaving the cinder blocks under it the way it is and Commissioner Segner stated yes, the purist view is that if he came here in two years, he would say that building didn't change much, and he knows it is not cheap. Kevin indicated that money isn't driving this; Mr. Ponder has never said to see how we can do this as inexpensively as possible, but we are trying to create a building that . . . one of the things was the Uptown Character District, and that is not the Commission's concern, but we have that concern over here, and he spent some time in Uptown and looked at a lot of the old rock buildings in town that are commercial front buildings, and there is no divided light windows in them, so he understood they were trying to create a balance. Chair Unger indicated that she understands that, but one of the reasons we haven't landmarked any of those buildings is purely that.

Commissioner Schudson asked for more information about the plans for the porch and its removal. Kevin Dunlap explained that the existing porch is structurally unsafe. The Commissioner then asked if the porch was part of the original structure and Kevin and staff indicated that they don't know. Audree Juhlin indicated that we have no evidence to verify that one way or the other, as to when the porch was added. In the packet, there is a black and white photo of a porch that looks like it was thrown together and it isn't the nicest porch in the world. Commissioner Schudson then asked if it is correct that because we haven't determined the exact porch, it wouldn't be a sticking point in terms of historic integrity. Chair Unger stated that she doesn't know that is correct, and Audree Juhlin stated it is not a yes or no answer; it is an unknown. The inventory doesn't give enough information and the picture doesn't tell us a lot, so it is basically making a best guess as to what would be appropriate. Going back to the Jordan House, as we did the research, we found that a number of different things happened to that roof and as stated, it is at what point in time we are going to replicate the historic value.

Commissioner Schudson then asked if when a property is landmarked, it is exempt from City Code compliance, and Audree Juhlin stated no. The Commissioner then asked if it must

comply with all City Codes and Audree Juhlin explained there is reasonableness, a common sense clause for historic buildings. Those buildings built 50-100 years ago aren't going to meet the Building Codes, so we have to apply the law of common sense in applying those codes. Commissioner Schudson indicated that regarding the roofs, he understands that different pitches under the City Codes require different materials, so if the Commission wanted to see the look of a flat roof continue, but for reasons of protection and preservation of the building overall, it would be useful to slightly pitch that roof to shed water, while preserving a flat look, is that something that is conceivable?

Chair Unger noted that is why she was trying to find out how much of a pitch you need to use the Corten. Kevin Dunlap indicated that he would have to consult the roofer, but it is probably somewhere about 1½ to 2, so it would bring it down quite a bit. Audree Juhlin noted that brings out the core of the issue, it is the balancing act that she put in the Staff Report. How you balance these competing values, because we have to meet the Building Codes where we can and meet the Land Development Code and our design codes, in addition to the Secretary of Interior's Standards, so it is not one; it is a combination of those things to make the best possible product. We are going to be looking at ADA energy efficiency and commercial grade versus residential grade where we can, absolutely. We will be doing that at the staff level, and that is the difficult part that they have in bringing something forward. The Commission might approve it, but staff might reject it, so how do we find a compromise in approving something.

Commissioner Schudson commented that ultimately he sees the potential for compatibility in something like this, because historic integrity and commercial viability go hand-in-hand. The ultimate commercial viability of this property depends at least on the City and the owners being able to say look at how true this building is to the original. It is one more special reason to shop there; it allows for that plaque on the door that brings people in, and it brings praise to the owners and the City for coming together to see the compatibility of historic integrity and commercial viability, although the price might be a little higher.

Kevin Dunlap indicated that in trying to find solutions, the condition of the doors and windows on the front of the building are sound, because they have been protected, so if the Commission's objective is that it look as it does now, then these windows and doors can be sanded, cleaned, painted and remain intact on the front elevation, although he doesn't think they are the original windows, but if that is what the Commission wants, that is an option. The windows on the rest of the building cannot even be bumped without falling apart, so there needs to be an agreed-upon window. Personally, he respectfully disagrees with the Commission's decision on a storefront like this in Uptown, because he sees a lot of very attractive buildings that present themselves as historic red rock buildings. Are they authentic? Because of the windows probably not, but do they allow passers-by to see what the retailer is trying to do. Chair Unger noted that most of those have come to the Commission wanting to landmark, so understand that it is at a high level that the building has met to become a landmark. It is a major thing and it is one of the more important buildings in town, because it is a red rock building that is landmarked. Most of them have had windows removed and redone, and they have done things that have compromised them historically.

Commissioner Schudson stated that everyone is trying to find a way to say yes, so procedurally how do we allow that process to develop so that together we can work toward yes? Is there an opportunity to table the discussion to allow the applicant to take this into consideration or do we set up some committee to work on this? Audree Juhlin pointed out that we need to open this item up to the public.

Chair Unger stated that if we can come to something, and then allow them to take a look at it, that is the most important thing we can do today. She wants to move this ahead as quickly as we can, because time is of the essence. We can possibly come up with something in a motion that allows them to take a look and the Commission to clear it in that respect, but she wants as much input . . . because once we start discussing, she doesn't know that we can really go back.

Kevin Dunlap requested that the Commission not deny the project, but tell them what you want and what you are willing to approve, and let them figure out how to make that work. Chair Unger agreed that is what the Commission wants to do.

*Chair Unger opened the public comment period at this time.*

**Kathy Levin, Board Member of the Sedona Arts Center, Sedona, AZ, and Pam Frazier, Executive Director of the Sedona Arts Center, Village of Oak Creek, AZ:** Kathy Levin indicated that she filled out the comment card to address the issue that the Sedona Arts Center would like to bring to your attention and to comment about the proposal. Regarding the proposal, most of her concerns have been raised, which included maintaining the original materials, including the wood windows. Those might be cross-plugged doors, which perhaps are original, and she wondered if the air conditioning unit could be ground-mounted, which was done with the Jordan homestead and the Bennet-Purtymun Cabin, when their equipment was replaced, but it may not be feasible.

Kevin Dunlap indicated they could do that, but there are two zones -- one is an upstairs zone and one is a downstairs zone. If the upstairs equipment is put on the ground, they will have to run duct work up the exterior of the building, which they don't want to do, so the proposal for the upstairs equipment was to create a screening that is compatible to the building, and the lower unit would be a combination of an air handler within the building downstairs and a remote AC condenser. The issue with getting the upstairs equipment on the ground would be getting the primary supply and return air ducts on the outside of the building, which wouldn't be a good idea. Chair Unger agreed that would be worse and Audree Juhlin noted that staff wouldn't have supported that.

Kathy Levin indicated that she is also concerned about adding a pitched overhang; the Pushmataha landmarked property also has a porch and a flat roof. It may well have been originally flat, based on those things that you pointed out that would have been used for braces. Kevin Dunlap indicated that their proposal is closer, but it is hard to say.

Kathy Levin then noted that it was interesting that the Main Street Character District was brought up as a way to evaluate this project. In her mind, you would want to look to the Land Development Code and the U.S. Department of Interior's Standards, and the Main Street Guidelines have more to do with new construction and maintaining existing buildings, not so much to address historic structures that are landmarked. Landmarked buildings shouldn't emulate what is in Uptown, it might be the reverse.

Kathy then stated that she and Pam are here together, because of an issue that is not within your jurisdiction, but they wanted to bring it up because of the public hearing. There is a lot of visitation to the Sedona Arts Center, and while the City of Sedona has put up a convex mirror there, it is difficult to come up with cars parked in front, so Kathy chatted with Audree before the meeting and rather than have the Commission discuss whether or not cars should be there, they wanted to have an opportunity to underscore their concern about the visibility issue at that corner for exiting vehicles wanting to go south.

Pam Frazier indicated that historically the nose-in parking in that area has been a serious safety issue for them, when creeping out into traffic to see what is coming from the north. The mirror helps some, especially for those who use it daily and can interpret it. It is a little difficult for the casual one-time visitor to interpret and even to notice, so she wanted to get it on the record that they have those concerns. Also, she is delighted to have the Ponders as a neighbor and she is pleased that someone is going to be taking good care of that building, but they really would like to be able to work with them on ways to mitigate that issue.

Kevin Dunlap noted that they were alerted to the fact that there were concerns about the parking today, and what he and Mr. Ponder have discussed is to take those concerns seriously

and evaluate that with Audree and the staff, to see if they can create a parking proposal, maybe with parallel and handicap parking there in front, and a couple of spaces if someone needs to walk-in. He doesn't know that Mr. Ponder is willing to agree to take the parking out today, but they are going to try to look at that concern to see what they can come up with. Pam Frazier indicated that she is sure that they will be able to work compatibly together.

**Brian and Samantha Alcorn, owners of La Vista Motel and the Heart of Sedona Coffee, Sedona, AZ:** Brian indicated that the building definitely needs attention and to be brought up to standards, so he hopes you are planning a balance between what works from a commercial aspect, because that is their business and if there is retail space, it is going to be better for their guests. Also, the parking situation makes it hard to see, but his biggest concern is the building to the north. Obviously, it is cracked and about ready to fall down, and they have agreed that it is something that needs to be rebuilt, and it is one inch off of his property line, so he wants to know if they are rebuilding it to the exact footprint or going to leave enough egress/ingress, because if any service goes to the back of the building, it has to cross his property, so will there be enough space for the egress/ingress?

Kevin Dunlap indicated that the building is currently within a few inches of the lot line and he had asked Mr. Ponder to start a conversation about getting a temporary easement or whatever is needed, so they can do what they want to do, and this is not an uncommon problem. Once the building is completed, there are no doors or anything that would require continued access along that wall, and if you go along the wall, at some point, you hit that retaining wall, so there is no way to get from there back. He doesn't know that there is a need for ongoing access personally, but he doesn't know if Mr. Ponder has any thoughts about once it is done, other than putting a coat of stain on the building. Mr. Ponder noted that the power meter is currently back there, and Kevin explained that they intend to take the overhead power that comes to the building now and place it underground; unless that is something the Commission has an issue with. Chair Unger stated that the Commission doesn't have an issue with that.

Chair Unger indicated that the porch is no longer in any condition to keep it there; it has to be replaced. It is not safe at this stage and you are using rough-sawn timber, but is the current material rough-sawn timber? Kevin explained that the front posts are sort of a partially-cut peeled log standing on cinder blocks on the sidewalk. Audree Juhlin noted that staff can't determine when those were put in and it doesn't indicate it in the inventory either. The Chair then indicated that instead of doing that, you are planning to put in 8 x 8s and staining them. Kevin explained that it is an oil stain, and they will probably have to construct some pad footings underneath; that is part of the engineering piece.

Chair Unger noted that in the other photograph, they didn't have any posts. They probably hung it off of the roof. Audree Juhlin stated that is what they think the I-bolts were. Chair Unger then asked if it would be possible to do that again, because that would leave it more open for people to look in there. Commissioner Segner indicated that they probably used a wrought iron buckle with two pieces together that moved a little and hung them from the ceiling, and hung the roof off of it. You would have found a big piece of 3/4-inch steel coming down and that would be fine, and you would see more into your operation.

Kevin Dunlap indicated that he is not sure what we are trying to do, are we trying to make it look like what we think it looked like or what it looked like when it was designated or what they want it to look like now; that is the direction they need. They can come to a solution, but he doesn't know what the Commission is trying to do.

Chair Unger indicated that if they feel it is feasible to hang the roof rather than use the supports . . . Kevin pointed out that he would have to have his engineer evaluate that, and Chair Unger agreed that engineering-wise, she doesn't know if it would be safe. Kevin indicated that certainly was part of what was there at one time, but what the roof looked like, he doesn't know. Those turn buckles coming out of the rock were there hanging the roof, and the Chair added

that you don't know when those turn buckles were put in; however, Kevin stated that they are original.

Chair Unger then stated that the Commission's discussion will have to be whether we need to go back to that then. There are two possibilities -- going back to that or constructing it as it is now. Mr. Ponder indicated that his preference would be in favor of the wooden supports that are there now, because it makes it look like an Old West building. They could pull up there and tie their horse up and that is part of the character of the building. The Chair agreed that it has been there long enough to consider it part of the character, so she is fine with that; she was just trying to determine all of the possibilities.

Mr. Ponder then requested consideration for at least some slope on the roof, because it is so low. and to drain the water off. There have been water intrusions in the building, which is costing some considerable money to repair. Kevin Dunlap explained that it is because of the lack of maintenance. The windows and roof have leaked for a long time and it has allowed water to get into the building in places. Mr. Ponder explained that if there is a flat roof, he is concerned that in some of these downpours, it will infiltrate back into the building. Chair Unger stated that the difference is if it is Corten, you really want to have it up a little, because it has to run off.

Chair Unger then asked how deep the roof is and Kevin indicated it is 5 to 5½ ft. The Chair then indicated that if it is 2-12, there will be a 10-inch difference between the front and back. Commissioner Segner indicated that doesn't bother him as much as the Corten, just because it is going to look uniform. Kevin then asked if there is another corrugated metal that would be preferred, and Commissioner Segner stated that on a flat roof, they probably would have used tar paper. Audree pointed out that the notes say that the porch had an aluminum awning, but it doesn't say if it was flat or pitched, it just says, "Aluminum awning over entrances on front façade". Commissioner Segner then indicated that when you use the Corten, it catches the water and has to come down the front, then be caught and moved to the side, where with a regular roofing material like at Jordan Park, it works fine. They were never easy to drain; they used to put a hole in the corner, and they swamped it and it came down, so the frustration is that it is a giant pain to do it, and we are trying to see if it can be done close to how they used to do it, which wasn't necessarily the best or most practical. It is the most unique building in all of Sedona and you can look at it as this is a pain or it is kind of fun looking for the old wood and fixtures, etc., then it is not that much more expensive, but it can be a challenge.

Kevin Dunlap indicated that he would agree, but this building has gone through evolutions and what you are seeing wasn't built very well and was not really that historic, unless you want to key history back to some point when the Jordan's built it and where we are now. The Commissioner stated that he keys it back to the day it was landmarked. Kevin then asked if they want a new evaporative cooler on it; that is the kind of considerations they are getting to.

Audree noted that a compromise is needed and if the Commission isn't going to approve it, some very clear guidelines are needed, and there are a number of time considerations. When she spoke with SHPO about this and other projects, there is no cut and clear answer in historic preservation, but she does believe and what they indicated is that just because it was done that way in the past, it doesn't make it the best thing for the future, for practical reasons as far as construction that wasn't the best, so if we have an opportunity to bring something into better efficiency and effectiveness for its continued use in the future, then we need to look at those things too, so replicating something that didn't work well in the past may not be appropriate moving forward.

Chair Unger indicated that her feeling on the windows is pretty set, and she would like the porch to be as flat as we can make it, to ensure that mirror look. Looking at the Corten with very little tilt, you won't see much of it anyway, so that is something to be taken into

consideration, because it is not a big part. A 4-12 pitch is quite a bit higher and would have a visible impact.

Kevin Dunlap indicated that their goal is to get approval and time is of the essence, and the Commission has presented a lot of issues, but none that can't be resolved, so his suggestions, subject to Mr. Ponder's agreement, are on the storefront one solution is to remove the bars, etc., that aren't historic, and clean-up the existing storefront in its current condition and the integrity of the doors and windows are functional. If Mr. Ponder doesn't agree to that, we may need to appeal the Commission's decision, but he is trying to find a solution. Regarding the windows on the south and east side of the building, if it is the Commission's position that you want a wood divided-light window to replicate what is there, it is technically feasible. There is no problem doing that, but it presents maintenance issues, although that is not his problem; he will build it and install it right, and then Mr. Ponder will have to maintain it. Regarding the roof, he feels strongly that to build a flat roof is not practical unless it is steel. If it is made out of wood products, it is going to leak. He would like to consider flattening the pitch and whether they put the posts in the front or not, they could evaluate the turnstiles on the building and hang the roof, but he would like to see something that isn't flat up there. Even a flat roof in Arizona is not built flat, and unfortunately, this is. Most flat roofs get some kind of parapet, so it is a different concept. Therefore, he suggests flattening the pitch to not create as much of a visibility factor, and they could use another metal if Corten bothers you, but he likes the corrugated metal, because it is in keeping with what the Jordan family may have done, according to other properties they owned and developed, so maybe they can come up with something other than Corten and either hang it or post it. Although he does agree with Audree that just because it was done in the past, it doesn't make it a sound structure, and building something that is functional and sound is one of your guidelines too.

Chair Unger asked if there is any way of recreating the posts that are there and Kevin stated certainly. The Chair indicated if the Commission is going to that, she would like to see that happen. One of her biggest questions was the 8 x 8s, but if we could go with the chinked logs that would give it the western character, but the 8 x 8s will look like an add-on. If we can drop that pitch and use those in the front . . . Commissioner Grams commented that she likes that, and Chair Unger continued to say that she likes the idea of hanging it, but she also wants to be respectful of what the applicant feels.

Audree Juhlin noted that the Commission needs to determine at what point in time you are bringing it back to, and perhaps what you are proposing is a compromise, so you get the pitch for the drainage and the chinked logs for the wood posts. It is not exactly what it was, but we are combining a number of things and creating functionality and efficiency.

Mr. Ponder indicated that he appreciates the Commission's time and they will work with the Commission as best they can.

*Chair Unger closed the public comment period at this time.*

#### **Commission's Summary Discussion:**

Commissioner Schudson indicated that he would support the windows as expressed, save the door that seems to be original, allow for a slight modification to the roof for the future protection of the building, and the preservation of the porch. Thank you.

*Note: Commissioner Schudson left the meeting at approximately 5:45 p.m.*

Chair Unger stated that the proposal is to maintain the integrity of the historic front, all of the wooden pieces of the historic front, but remove the bars, which is a brilliant idea in that it really doesn't lend itself to the look of the building and only complicates somebody looking inside. That makes a lot of sense, because that wasn't original and was added on. Part of the Commission's discussion is whether or not we have them do the wooden windows or allow the

clad windows. Her inclination is to say do wooden, because that is what was already there, and that is the second part that would have to go into the motion. The third part is the roof on the porch; we asked them to bring the pitch down as low as it can come. She is hoping it will be under two inches, but if it is 2-12 pitch with that length . . . it has to be a 2-12, and because that will make it sort of disappear there, then we allow them to use the Corten on that roof. In the front, use chinked posts with the 8 x 8s or whatever structure you need underneath. It doesn't have to be chinked posts underneath, you can use the 8 x 8s and oil them.

Kevin Dunlap noted that unless they hang the roof, there will have to be a structural beam across that porch, and Chair Unger agreed and indicated that will have to be an 8 X 8 or more. Kevin indicated that he doesn't know, but as he understands it, the objective is to not use a square piece of rough-sawn timber. Chair Unger stated that no, you can, because it is square now. Kevin explained that it is almost like a D Lock, which means it is cut on a couple of sides and one side has a little bit of log roundness to it. The Chair indicated that if they can reconstruct it using those similar materials, that would work.

Commissioner Segner indicated that he is going to give the purist's view. The windows are a given, you are going to have to put the wood windows in and keep the front doors. There is one little bit of character in this town and you own it. He finds the old door knobs and locks, and you keep them. Kevin explained that the hardware has been updated; however, the Commissioner indicated that he has a box of hardware and will give it to them, but look for those things. He is fine with the pitch, and he will discuss the Corten with you, but if you buy zinc and acid treat it, it would be a little more mottled. Corten is too consistent, and the zinc may be cheaper. On the light fixtures, he would encourage you to find the old ones on EBay. Kevin explained that he has gone to a specialty company and they do come in enameled colors. Commissioner Segner noted that he is just throwing it out as an idea.

Audree Juhlin pointed out that the lighting has to be dark sky compliant, and Chair Unger stated that as long as it is the old style, she appreciates the work they have done. Kevin noted that it doesn't have to be the galvanized and that is the Commissioner's point. Commissioner Segner then stated that when the porch is rebuilt, he would suggest finding old wood or something a little more mottled, so look for weather-beaten wood. Otherwise, he doesn't have a problem. He is okay with the little pitch on the roof, but he didn't want to see Corten like that.

Commissioner Grams ask if they are going to consider hanging the roof; it is only five feet and that is a very short span, but how long is it? Audree Juhlin indicated it is the entire length and Kevin added probably about 28 ft. long. The Commissioner then stated that she loved idea of the old chains; they would be charming. Commissioner Segner noted that without the wood posts, you would see inside more.

Mr. Ponder explained that he is concerned about suspending that much weight on the roof of an old structure and we have no way to test it. Chair Unger indicated that if somebody came along and decided to hang it; they could in the future. We aren't making a real dog's dinner out of the building, it is still feasible if they want to go ahead and hang it, but the owner . . .

Audree Juhlin stated that to clarify for the Conditions of Approval for the porch roof, the Commission is okay with the 2-12 pitch and with either option of support, as indicated. Chair Unger agreed that she would leave that to the owner to figure out. Either way it can be changed, it is not a huge thing.

Kevin Dunlap asked if they evaluate that and the Structural Engineer says based on the way the roof is built, they can hang it, then do they need to come back. Chair Unger stated no, and Audree Juhlin stated they will have two options. Commissioner Grams stated that if you hang it, you will not need the huge supporting timber; however, Kevin stated yes, they would. That was their original objective and Mr. Ponder felt that by putting the building and porch back with the posts, it was more authentic, so they moved off of that as a design consultant. Audree

Juhlin noted that staff also supported that. Chair Unger stated that she has no problem either way, and now someone needs to make the motion.

**MOTION: Commissioner Holmes moved to approve case number CA14-00003 (CofA) to renovate and rehabilitate the historic structure known as the "George Jordan Sales Building" located at 470 N. Highway 89A, based on satisfaction of the findings outlined in the Sedona Land Development Code and other Code requirements, Sedona Main Street Design and Character District guidelines and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation guidelines as outlined in the Staff Report, with specifications that they rebuild the wooden windows as they exist on all sides of the building . . .**

Kevin Dunlap clarified that they are proposing to repair the existing window frontage and replace the other windows in kind. Commissioner Holmes suggested replacing it with the style of windows that now exist in the building.

Audree Juhlin explained that it doesn't have to get into that detail in the motion; you can say everything you have said, as the Commission has stated in the minutes of this meeting. Then, we will take those minutes and put those into the Conditions of Approval for the Certificate and not get into the specifics here.

**REVISED MOTION: Commissioner Holmes moved to approve case number CA14-00003 (CofA) to renovate and rehabilitate the historic structure known as the "George Jordan Sales Building" located at 470 N. Highway 89A, based on satisfaction of the findings outlined in the Sedona Land Development Code and other Code requirements, Sedona Main Street Design and Character District guidelines and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation guidelines as outlined in the Staff Report, and add guidelines as are outlined in our Historic Commission minutes during our meeting today. Commissioner Segner seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried four (4) for and zero (0) opposed. (Vice Chair Jarmusch was excused and Commissioner Schudson was not present.)**

Commissioner Segner stated that it may have been a little unfair to have you draw up your plans before talking with the Commission, so we may need to think about having applicants come to us to discuss the ideas first.

**7. Discussion regarding future meeting dates and future agenda items (5 minutes, 5:25-5:30)**

Audree Juhlin stated that the next meeting is September 8th and Commissioner Grams indicated that she is not available.

**8. Adjournment (5:30)**

The Chair called for adjournment at 6:02 p.m., without objection.

I certify that the above is a true and correct summary of the actions of the Historic Preservation Commission in the meeting held on August 11, 2014.

---

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Administrative Assistant*

---

Date